

SB-141, Bullying in Montana Schools

EXHIBIT 12
DATE 3/21/2011
SB 141

Lori Page

(Monday, 3/21 at 3 p.m. in rm 137).

I'm concerned about bullying but I'm also concerned because some are saying bullying legislation is really a Trojan Horse. Even a brief search combining the terms "bullying" and "Comprehensive Sex Ed" yields dozens of articles from all over showing there is a correlation between the two, and the two programs often go into schools at the same time or in tandem.

The usual pattern seems to be 1. Put a bullying policy in place. 2. Then list parties who need protection and include the terms "sexual orientation" and "gender identity" 3. Finally, put in a health curriculum that includes the teaching of risky sexual lifestyle options supposedly to support bullying policy. To support bullying policy is a primary reason listed for implementation of this sort of teaching

Bullying policy is an integral part of what happened in Helena School District with the adoption of the controversial curriculum. See the attached information sheet to see how crucial the bullying policy was to the adoption of the New Helena Health Curriculum that is to go in effect in September, 2011.

On top of everything else, a carefully written bullying policy provides a safety net for those who implement controversial sex ed curricula enabling them to expose children to almost any type of sexual behavior without educators being held to accountability.

I agree bullying is a huge problem, but given the pattern of what is happening around the country with bullying policies as well as what happened in Helena School District, ~~I think this bullying policy should be amended in one of the following~~

I AM ASKING YOU TO VOTE AGAINST THIS BILL

Bullying Policy and Adoption of Comprehensive Sex Ed in Helena

During the same time frame some offensive discussion was deleted from the health curriculum proposal, additions were made subtly authorizing & perhaps requiring educators to provide information and/or discussion to children on some of the disputed topics.

The first of these additions was page 26, the insertion of district policy. Although this may have been written previously, its timely insertion into the health curriculum proposal shines a new light on the policy's assertion that **all grades** are to develop an understanding of district policy including the terms "sexual identity" and "sexual orientation," terms which are controversial issues in the proposal.

The second addition on page 40 states that children K-3rd grades may receive reproductive system instruction "as conditions arise." What? Since all children are to be instructed in district policy including the words "sexual identity" and "sexual orientation," could that be defined as an "arising condition"? I'm just trying to show what an umbrella is created by the district policy addition.

Finally, on the same date these other changes were introduced, Dr. Messinger explained to his board he'd deleted discussion to be held with 1st and 2nd graders on p. 49 that was offensive to some, but the intent of the proposal was still preserved because those discussions would essentially be covered under two of his additions, p. 26, the school district policy and p. 42, the nonspecific topic of "family structures differ."

So apparently district policy and general terms like "family structures differ" can work as umbrellas for hiding controversial deleted material. That is my understanding. What is yours? (All the above additions and changes were introduced to the public at the September 14th 2010 School Board Meeting which is recorded.)